

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9 and 10 have been amended and claims 11-17 have been added herein. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claim priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 2, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly lacking patentable utility.

In response to the rejections of claim 1, Applicants respond that claim 1 and dependent claims 2-8, indeed recite tangible steps that have utility, including, for example, "importing the source text file into the spreadsheet file" and "applying the selected file format profile to the imported source text file".

In response to the rejection of claim 2 wherein Examiner alleges that claim 2 is not further limiting of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree. Dependent claim 2 adds *inter alia* the step of "*creating* at least one file format profile," while independent claim 1 includes *inter alia* the step of only "*selecting* a file format profile." Respectfully, selecting an element is not the same as creating the same element (i.e., file format profile).

In response to the rejection of claim 9 and 10, Applicants have amended claims 9 and 10 so as that they no longer an alleged "hybrid claim".

Appl. No. 10/615,505

Reply to Office Action of 12/14/05

Page 6 of 8

In view of the foregoing, Applicants content that the requisite statutory threshold is met in each of the cited claims, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Khoyi et al. (US Patent No. 5,303,379), hereinafter "Khoyi". Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is allowable for at least the reasons stated below.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Khoyi does not disclose, *inter alia*, "importing the plurality of source text files into the spreadsheet file". (emphasis added) Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Khoyi only speaks to a linking mechanism for linking data between objects (*see* Title; claim preambles) and not to an importation. That is, the linking that is used in Khoyi, as defined in Khoyi, does not include an importation of source text file into the spreadsheet file. The definition of linking, in Khoyi, can be found at col. 3, lines 52 – 64. "This linking of data from a child object to a parent object is distinct from the copying of data from one object to another in that the data which is linked *remains a part of the child object rather than becoming an integral part of the parent object.*" (emphasis added). Clearly, there is no importation of objects, nor of source text files, in that the objects, in Khoyi are merely linked and yet remain residing as child objects.

In view of the foregoing, Khoyi does not anticipate the current invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections. Similarly, independent claims 9 and 10 are believe allowable for the same reasons stated above.

Moreover, regarding claim 1, Applicants submit that Khoyi does not disclose, *inter alia*, formatting and eventually importing a "plurality" of source text files, as in the present invention.

Appl. No. 10/615,505

Reply to Office Action of 12/14/05

Page 7 of 8


See claim 1, as amended. To the contrary, Khoyi in its entirety only discusses and discloses exchanges between a child and a parent object and/or a first object and a second object. See for example, note the preamble of claim 1 in Khoyi which includes "a link mechanism for linking data from a first object into a second object". In view of the foregoing, Khoyi does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-17 are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features.

## CONCLUSIONS

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph J. Christian  
Reg. No. 51,560

Date: 2/28/06

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14th Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

Appl. No. 10/615,505  
Reply to Office Action of 12/14/05

Page 8 of 8